REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-42 remain pending in the application, Claim 37 having been amended to correct a punctuation error, namely, the omission of a colon after the word "comprising."

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objects to the specification because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (see applicants' specification, page 13, line 5). The Examiner requires applicants to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code.

However, the hyperlink is included as an example of the type of query generated and sent to an SPTS server, where a URL and folder in the query represent values that specify a URL and a folder name, respectively. Therefore, it is necessary to include an exemplary hyperlink in the specification of this patent application in order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. This hyperlink is merely an example and not included to provide an actual link to any actual web site on the Internet. Applicants respectfully request that the Office disable this hyperlink when preparing the text to be loaded onto the USPTO web database. To require applicants to delete the exemplary hyperlink will adversely impact the disclosure of an exemplary embodiment of the invention.

Claims 1 and 3-42 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1 and 3-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Ferguson et al. (U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0065849 - hereinafter referred to as "Ferguson"). In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this response, the following discussion focuses on independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 25, 31, 35, 36, and 37. The patentability of each remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's conclusion that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly, applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every comment made by the Examiner, should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims. Indeed, applicants believe that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited.

1 However, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent

2 claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the

3 dependent claims ultimately depend.

4 <u>Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 1</u>

5   With respect to independent Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Ferguson discloses applicants'

6 step(b), which recites "displaying the Web view page in the dialog box of the application program."

7 The Examiner asserts that Ferguson teaches this step because Ferguson discloses that the technique of

8 the developer constructing embedded application web pages may find two or more pages at a given

9 web site, and the Examiner cites paragraph 0199 in this reference. Applicants respectfully disagree

10 because Ferguson does not appear to teach or suggest displaying a Web view page and does not

11 appear to teach or suggest a dialog box object that is provided from within the application program.

12   First, it should be noted that applicants claim a *Web view page*, which is different than a *Web*

13 *page*. Applicants' define a Web view page as that which allows production of custom views and

14 functions of a directory structure on a server without having to change the application program (see

15 applicants' specification, page 2, lines 28-29), and applicants provide two examples in FIGURE 3B

16 and FIGURE 4. Applicants' specification further states the following:

17   For example, a Web view page can be limited to only the folders and file
18   relevant to a specific target user and/or a specific application. Unlike the current
            ability to filter files only by type (e.g., list all files of the form *.doc), custom Web
19   view pages would make it relatively easy to find specific types of files, such as
            WORD documents about customers in a specific geographic region when the Web
20   view page is opened in the WORD application. Also, it should be possible to limit the
            type of file or folder without having to rely on long or cryptic file names. Messages
21   and other information relevant to a target user and/or application program can be made
22   accessible from the application program, instead of on a separate Web page accessed
23   by a conventional separate browser. This feature should eliminate the need for users
            to switch between a browser and a software application to access such information
24   (see applicants' specification, page 2, line 29 – page 3, line 6).
25

26   In contrast, Ferguson teaches in paragraph 0199 that a word processing version of each of two

27 or more pages at a given Web site that are related may be created and stored within a single enhanced

28 word processing document. Thus, Ferguson has the capability of storing multiple web pages within a

29 single document and can provide the ability to improve interoperability and integration between what

30 were originally disconnected pages. Thus, one can download the single enhanced word processing

-10-

1 document containing the multiple embedded application web pages, and presumably, the user can

2 then view the document in an application program.

3 But, applicants point out that unlike step(b) in their claim, where *the Web view page in the*

4 *dialog box* is displayed in the application program, Ferguson instead appears to teach that the *word*

5 *processing document* is displayed in the application program. A word processing document, although

6 enhanced with embedded application web pages, is not equivalent to applicants' definition of the

7 Web view pages, as illustrated in FIGURES 3B and 4, and as defined in dependent Claim 2, as one

8 format in which a dialog box is displayable. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Ferguson's enhanced

9 word processing document were equivalent to a Web view page, the Web view page is further

10 displayed *in a dialog box* in applicants' invention. In contrast, Ferguson does not disclose or suggest

11 that the word processing document is displayed in or even includes a dialog box.

12 The Examiner also asserts that Ferguson discloses applicants' step(a) that recites "in the

13 application program, providing a dialog box object that communicates with a browser module." The

14 Examiner asserts that Ferguson teaches this step, because productivity application 100 is launched

15 along with the network enabling software 210, and because the network enabling software 210 (being

16 appropriately configured) automatically launches when the productivity application 100 is launched.

17 Further, the Examiner cites paragraph 147 of Ferguson. Upon such selection, a parameter

18 information dialog box, such as displayed in Figure 16E may be presented. Also, the Examiner cites

19 paragraph 204.

20 It appears that the Examiner is asserting that productivity application 100, the parameter

21 information dialog box, and network enabling software 210 are equivalent to applicants' claimed

22 application program, dialog box object, and browser module, respectively. Assuming, *arguendo*, that

23 this assertion were true, it does not appear that Ferguson teaches or suggests that the dialog box

24 object is provided by the application program. The parameter information dialog box is generated by

25 selection of, for example, the value button provided in the display of FIGURE 16D (see Ferguson

26 paragraph 0204). And FIGURE 16D is the result of a wizard being launched (see Ferguson

27 paragraph 0203). However, Ferguson does not specifically teach or suggest that the wizard that

28 generates the parameter information dialog box is actually provided from within the application

29 program, as applicants claim in step(a). Indeed, the wizard could be part of a tool installed on the

30 user's computer, e.g., a tool provided with an application program or with a different program. As

-11-

1   indicated by FIGURES 16A-16D, it does not appear that the Juice wizard is activated from within an

2   application program, such as a word processing document application program, since as shown in

3   FIGURE 16C, this wizard is called the "Juice Software" and appears to be a second program that is

4   run in connection with an application program.

5   Therefore, since Ferguson does not teach or suggest a Web view page and does teach or

6   suggest providing a dialog box object from within the application program, the rejection of

7   independent Claim 1 over Ferguson should be withdrawn. Because dependent claims include all of

8   the elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claims ultimately depend,

9   dependent Claims 2-9 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in regard to independent

10   Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 2-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be

11   withdrawn.

12   <u>Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 10</u>

13   With respect to independent Claim 10, the Examiner asserts that Ferguson discloses step(a) of

14   Claim 10 that recites "determining whether a computing resource supports a Web view page in the

15   application program dialog box; and if so." The Examiner asserts that Ferguson discloses that step

16   since Ferguson teaches the technique of the augmented desktop application and enhanced document

17   together form an Internet or network-enabled application that facilitates access to remote services and

18   functionality while retaining functionality inherently provided by the desktop application; the

19   Examiner cites paragraph 0055 of Ferguson. However, since this citation does not provide a

20   disclosure for a Web view page, for much the same reasons discussed above, Ferguson does not teach

21   a Web view page. This citation also fails to teach or suggest another of applicants' claim elements,

22   i.e., an application program dialog box. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 10 over Ferguson should be

23   withdrawn. Because dependent claims include all of the elements of the independent claim from

24   which the dependent claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 11-18 are patentable for at least the

25   reasons discussed above in regard to independent Claim 10. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent

26   Claims 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

27   <u>Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 19</u>

28   With respect to independent Claim 19, the Examiner asserts that Ferguson anticipates this

29   claim, which recites a method for accessing a computer file stored on a computing resource from an

30   application program dialog box of an application program. However, since this claim recitation also

MS 154624.01
MICR0207-1-1\0207am 6-7-2005.doc

includes reference to a Web view page, for the reasons discussed above, thus, Ferguson does not teach all of the steps of Claim 19, and the rejection should be withdrawn. Because dependent claims include all of the elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 20-24 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in regard to independent Claim 19. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 25

With respect to independent Claim 25, the Examiner asserts that Ferguson anticipates applicants' claimed method for initiating an application program function using a browser module accessible from within a dialog box of an application program. However, this claim recitation also includes a reference to a Web view page, and, for the reasons discussed above, Ferguson does not teach all of the recitation of Claim 25, and this rejection should be withdrawn. Because dependent claims include all of the elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 26-30 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in regard to independent Claim 25. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 31

With respect to independent Claim 31, the Examiner asserts that Ferguson anticipates the method for performing a browser function within a dialog box of an application program. However, this claim recitation also refers to a Web view page. For the reasons discussed above, Ferguson does not teach this aspect of Claim 31, and the rejection should be withdrawn. Because dependent claims include all of the elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 32-34 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in regard to independent Claim 31. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 35

With respect to independent Claim 35, the Examiner asserts that Ferguson discloses a machine readable medium storing machine instructions for selectively opening a dialog box in an application program, and displaying a Web view page within the dialog box of the application program to enable a user to selectively execute a function from within the dialog box by selecting an

element on the Web view page. However, this claim recitation also includes a reference to a Web view page, and so for the reasons given above, Ferguson does not teach all of the claim limitations of Claim 35 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 36

With respect to independent Claim 36, the Examiner asserts that Ferguson discloses a machine readable medium storing machine instructions for generating a Web view page for display within a dialog box of an application program in response to a request for opening the Web view page in the dialog box. However, this claim recitation also includes a reference to a Web view page, and, for the reasons noted above, Ferguson does not teach this aspect of Claim 36. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 37

With respect to independent Claim 37, the Examiner asserts that Ferguson discloses a system for displaying a Web view page within a dialog box of an application program. However, this claim also refers to a Web view page. For the reasons discussed above, Ferguson does not teach this aspect of Claim 37, and the rejection should be withdrawn. Because dependent claims include all of the elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 38-42 are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 37. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 38-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009, 441 (Mathieu et al., hereinafter "Mathieu"). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include within Ferguson's invention, Mathieu's teachings of enabling a user to select a desired format from among the plurality of formats for displaying a dialog box, and in response thereto, displaying the dialog box within the application program in the desired format selected by the user. However, Claim 2 depends from independent Claim 1, which is patentable for the reasons discussed above. Because a dependent claim inherently includes all of the elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claim ultimately depends, dependent Claim 2 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ferguson in view of Mathieu should be withdrawn.

-14-

LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON
600 - 108th Avenue N.E., Suite 507
Bellevue, Washington 98004
Telephone: (425) 688-8816   Fax: (425) 646-6314

MS 154624.01
MICR0207-1-1\0207am 6-7-2005.doc

In view of the Remarks set forth above, it will be apparent that the claims in this application define a novel and non-obvious invention. The application is in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue without further delay. Should any further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Anderson

Ronald M. Anderson
Registration No. 28,829

RMA/SKM:lrg

MAILING CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid, addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 7, 2005.

Date: June 7, 2005